



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/518,634	12/20/2004	Masashi Otsuki	Q85398	4949
23373 7590 03/28/2008 SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037			EXAMINER WEINER, LAURA S	
			ART UNIT 1795	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 03/28/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/518,634

Applicant(s)

OTSUKI ET AL.

Examiner

/Laura S. Weiner/

Art Unit

1795

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 December 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-2, 7-26, drawn to a support salt and a nonaqueous electrolyte comprising the support salt.

Group II, claim(s) 3-4, drawn to a method of producing a support salt by reacting a phosphazene derivative of formula (III) with a primary amine to produce a phosphazene of formula V.

Group III, claim(s) 5-6, drawn to method for producing a support salt by reacting a phosphazene derivative of formula (VI) with a primary amine to produce a phosphazene of formula VII.

The inventions listed as Groups I-III do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

Group I claims a support salt and a nonaqueous electrolyte comprising the support salt versus Group II which claims a method of producing a support salt by reacting a phosphazene derivative of formula (III) with a primary amine to produce a phosphazene of formula V versus Group III which claims a method for producing a support salt by reacting a phosphazene derivative of formula (VI) with a primary amine to produce a phosphazene of formula VII.

2. This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

Species A, a support salt comprising Formula (I),

B, a support salt comprising Formula (II),

C, an electrolyte cell not further comprising a phosphazene derivative or an isomer of a phosphazene derivative. Claim 7

D, an electrolyte cell further comprising a phosphazene derivative, claim 8.

E, an electrolyte cell further comprising an isomer of a phosphazene derivative, claim 8.

F, A polymer cell comprising a polymer, claim 14.

G, a polymer cell further comprising a phosphazene derivative, claim 19.

H, a polymer cell further comprising an isomer of a phosphazene derivative, claim 19.

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

3. The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner:

Species A, a support salt selected as a) Formula (I) or b) (II) where A1 can be NRLi or F and R is a monovalent substituent (such as phenyl group).

Species B, a cell comprising a phosphazene derivative,
B1, Formula (VIII), claim 9, define Y1, Y2, Y3, R1, R2, R3 and X1.
B2, Formula (IX), claim 9, define R4.
B2a, Formula (X), claim 10.
B2b, Formula (XI), claim 11, define R5.
B3, Formula (VII), claim 12, define A3

Species C, a cell comprising an isomer of a phosphazene derivative.
C1, Formula (XIII), claim 13, define R7, R8, R9, Y7, Y8, Y9 and X2
C2, Formula (XIV), claim 13, define R7, R8, R9, Y7, Y8 and X2.

Species D, a polymer cell comprising a polymer, having a weight average molecular weight of not less than 10,000 or 5,000,000.

D1, polyethylene oxide
D2, polyacrylate
D3, a polypropylene oxide

Species E, a polymer cell comprising a phosphazene derivative,
E1, Formula (VIII), claim 20, define Y1, Y2, Y3, R1, R2, R3 and X1.
E2, Formula (IX), claim 20, define R4.
E2a, Formula (X), claim 21.
E2b, Formula (XI), claim 22, define R5.
E3, Formula (XII), claim 23, define R6

Species F, a polymer cell comprising an isomer of a phosphazene derivative.
F1, Formula (XIII), claim 24, define R7, R8, R9, Y7, Y8, Y9 and X2
F2, Formula (XIV), claim 24, define R7, R8, R9, Y7, Y8 and X2.

The following claim(s) are generic: None

4. The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: There are different phosphazene derivatives represented. Hence, the species are patentably distinct from each other.

5. A telephone call was not made due to the complexity to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, therefore did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

6. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim

remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to /Laura S. Weiner/ whose telephone number is 571-272-1294. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (6:30-4:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Ryan can be reached on 571-272-1292. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Laura S Weiner/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1795

March 23, 2008